

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 13 remain pending in this application. In response to the Office Action of August 12, 2003, in which all claims were rejected, claim 1 has been amended. Care has been taken to avoid the introduction of new matter.

Claims 1 through 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 6,369,909 (Shima). Shima has been applied to independent claim 1 and each of the remaining dependent claims. The statement of the rejection is identical to that applied in the earlier Office Action of March 12, 2003. In the Response of June 2, 2003, the rejection was traversed with arguments summarized as follows.

Shima states that a printer interprets print data expressed in a specific printer control language, and prepares and prints a print image of the document. The Office Action was understood to assert that the print data sent from a host computer to a printer corresponds to a file transfer protocol command sent out by the client and that a character string in an extension in a file name field, such as LPR, corresponds to a specific character string written on a file name field of the command.

By interpreting a command as an instruction only when the character string written on the file name field is a specific character string, even in case of a general FTP command, an instruction to make a printer execute a particular operation can be given to a printer, so that the printer notifies the host computer whether the printing is completed or not, for example. Moreover, in order to issue such instruction, there is no need to transfer a file.

However, as in Shima, if the print data includes various extension instructions to the printer, such instructions can be obtained by interpreting the data, and not by directly interpreting the file name itself. Shima teaches that the character string written on the file

name field is interpreted as a file name only, and fails to teach a configuration so as to interpret as a command a file transfer protocol command together with the string only when the character string written on the file name field is a specific character string. Patentability was urged for the requirement of claims 1 through 13 of interpretation of a character string written on the file name field of a command as an instruction only when the string is a specific character string, that is not disclosed in Shima.

In response to the Amendment, the final Office Action maintains the rejection "on the basis that a file name can be considered to be a character string that affects the control instruction, may be specific, and may be interpreted as a character string. Further amendment must be made in order for the Application to be considered for allowance." Such amendment has been made in the current response. Independent claim 1, as now amended, recites, *inter alia*, the following:

... there is provided command interpretation means that interprets a file transfer protocol command sent out by the client and a character string written on the file name field of said command as another command only when the string is a specific character string and generates a control instruction to said electronic equipment based on said file transfer protocol command and said another command.

The amended claims recite that the command interpretation means do not interpret a file name as an instruction, but interprets it as another command different from a file transfer protocol command. According to such configuration, the electronic devices such as the printer can be controlled based on a set of two different types of commands. Even though a set of a command and a file name can change an object corresponding to the file name, the electronic device can execute a particular operation corresponding to the command because there is only one command. On the contrary, in case of a set of two different types of


commands, the electronic device can execute different operations corresponding to such set of commands. Even if one of the commands is a FTP command as usual, by combining said command with another command, it is possible for the electronic device to execute a particular operation, which operation cannot be executed by the FTP command only.

It is submitted that Shima does not disclose any means for interpreting the file name, only when said file name is a specific character string, as another command different from a file name transfer protocol command. Thus Shima does not anticipate any of claims 1 through 13.

Accordingly, entry of the Amendment and allowance of the application are respectfully solicited. To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY


Gene Z. Rubinson
Registration No. 33,351

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
(202) 756-8000 GZR:lnm
Facsimile: (202) 756-8087
Date: October 31, 2003